

1574



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,194	03/24/2004	Kumar H. Chellapilla	M61.12-0616	4563

27366 7590 08/21/2007
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

RASHID, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/808,194

Applicant(s)

CHELLAPILLA ET AL.

Examiner

David P. Rashid

Art Unit

2624

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-41.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: refer to attachment.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Brian P. Werner/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
(SPE), Art Unit 2624

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendment to claim 41 requires reconsideration of the prior art of record.

Attachment to Paper 20070802A

Applicant's arguments filed August 7th, 2007 with respect to **claims 1, 6, 17, 22, 30, 34, and 41** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Summary of Remarks regarding claims 1, 17, and 30:

- (i) Applicant argues that the Office Action ignores that the text blocks, which are selectable by the user within the object data area, are inserted into respective fields of the electronic form in the form data area (per the language of claim 1), which is displayed simultaneously with the separate object data area (*@ response page 14*).
- (ii) Applicant argues that the limitations of claim 1 require that the fields of the electronic form are displayed in the form data area simultaneously with the identified text blocks in the object data area, as NewSoft does not disclose this step (*@ response page 15*).
- (iii) Applicant argues that even if the business card scanner of NewSoft were modified according to Zhou, the resulting combination would still fail to disclose or suggest the simultaneous display of a form data area and an object data area as recited in claim 1 or text blocks that are selectable by a user within the object data area for insertion into respective fields of the electronic form in the form data area (*@ response page 16*).

Examiner's Response:

- (i) The "Card Editor mode" (NewSoft, pg 11) anticipates element (c) of independent claim 1 (and equivalent counterparts of independent claims 17 and 30), as clearly outlined on page 4 of the previous Office Action. The claims do not recite inserting text blocks into respective fields of the electronic form in the form data area, and consideration of this outside limitation is not taken into account.
- (ii) As clearly outlined on page 4 of the previous Office Action, the "Card Editor mode" (NewSoft, pg 11) simultaneously displays the fields of the electronic form in the form data area with the identified text blocks in the object data area.
- (iii) For the reasons, given in Section (i) of the Examiner's Response, the "in the form data area" limitation is not considered as this outside limitation has not been incorporated into the claims.

Summary of Remarks regarding claim 41:

The elements (*@ response page 17*) are not disclosed by any of the cited references, either separately or in combination, and the elements would be non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art when looking at these references.

Examiner's Response:

The amended claim raise new issues that would require further consideration and search, and requires reconsideration of the prior art of record. See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a).

Summary of Remarks regarding claims 6, 22, and 34:

Claims 6, 23, and 34 depend from respective independent claims, which are new and non-obvious in view of the recited references discussed above. Accordingly, these claims are also new and non-obvious (*@ response page 17*).

Examiner's Response:

The independent claims are not new and non-obvious in view of the recited references for the reasons explain above. These claims are also not new and non-obvious.

/David P. Rashid/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Brian P. Werner/
Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE), Art Unit 2624